

For Reference

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

Ex LIBRIS
UNIVERSITATIS
ALBERTAENSIS





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2020 with funding from
University of Alberta Libraries

<https://archive.org/details/Dyck1972>

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

THE EFFECTS OF AUTHORITARIANISM, STATUS, AND REWARD
UPON THE EVALUATION OF OTHERS

by



RONALD JAMES DYCK

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF MASTER OF ARTS

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL, 1972

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled "The Effects of Authoritarianism, Status, and Reward Upon the Evaluation of Others" submitted by Ronald James Dyck in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

Date ...26 May 1972...

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this experiment was to investigate the effects of authoritarianism, status, and reward upon subjects' perception of and attraction towards two stimulus persons: a prior acquaintance ("Friend") and a stranger who either rewarded the Friend or the subjects ("Rewarder"). Both high and low authoritarian subjects evaluated the two stimulus persons on a number of personality scales and four interpersonal attraction scales both before and after either they or the Friend were preferentially rewarded by the Rewarder in a simulated game. Subsequently, subjects were given the opportunity to determine how much reward the Friend and Rewarder were to receive in the same game. Status of the Rewarder was found to differentially effect all subjects' liking for both the Rewarder and the Friend. However, high authoritarian subjects liked the high status Rewarder more and were more willing to participate in another project with him than low authoritarian subjects. Conversely, high authoritarian subjects liked the low status Rewarder less and were less willing to participate in another project with him than low authoritarian subjects. When both high and low authoritarian subjects were preferentially rewarded by the Rewarder, their liking for him, their perception of his liking for them, and their willingness to meet him socially, increased, whereas the opposite occurred when they were not preferentially rewarded. Regardless of the status of the Rewarder or reward itself, low authoritarian subjects maintained their liking relationship with the Friend. In contrast, high authoritarian subjects' liking for the Friend was affected by both status and reward. When the Rewarder was high

status, high authoritarian subjects' liking for the Friend remained relatively the same as in the pretest ratings. However, when the Rewarder was low status, high authoritarian subjects increased their liking for the Friend when he was preferentially rewarded, but, they decreased their liking for him when they were preferentially rewarded. When all subjects were making the choices in the game, there was a small but significant tendency to increase the reward to the Rewarder relative to the Friend if they had been preferentially rewarded by him, but a tendency to decrease the reward to the Rewarder relative to the Friend if they had not been so rewarded.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to acknowledge and thank Dr. Thorngate, my supervisor, and Dr. Kuiken who, in so many ways, were instrumental to the success of this project.

I wish to thank Dr. Foddy, my other committee member, for his assistance and cooperation.

To my wife Carol, I am especially grateful. Without her help and encouragement this thesis would have taken considerably longer to complete.

Special thanks go to my two confederates, Sue Goodwin and Lorne Cousins, who performed their roles so well.

I am also indebted to Claudia Mason for giving so much of her time and energy to the typing of this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract iii

Acknowledgements v

Table of Contents vi

List of Tables viii

Introduction 1

 Hypotheses 9

Method 11

 Subjects 11

 Design 12

 Apparatus and Materials 12

 Games 13

 Procedure 14

 Introduction of Subject and Friend 15

 Status Manipulation 16

 Pretest Ratings 17

 Reward Manipulation 17

 Post-test Ratings 18

 Choice Measures 18

Results 19

 Pretest Ratings 19

 Intercorrelations of the Four Interpersonal
 Attraction Scales 19

 Liking Scale 19

 Perceived Liking Scale 20

| | |
|--|----|
| Experimental Participation Scale | 21 |
| Meet Socially Scale | 22 |
| Remaining Scales | 22 |
| Post-test Ratings | 23 |
| Liking Scale | 23 |
| Perceived Liking Scale | 24 |
| Experimental Participation Scale | 25 |
| Meet Socially Scale | 25 |
| Remaining Scales | 26 |
| Behavioral Data | 26 |
| Discussion | 28 |
| References | 36 |
| Appendices | 39 |
| A California F Scale Items | 39 |
| B Rating Scales | 41 |
| C Game Matrices | 42 |
| D Instructions | 44 |
| E High and Low Status Answers | 47 |
| F Summary Tables of the Statistical Analysis | 49 |

LIST OF TABLES

| Table | | Page |
|-------|---|------|
| 1 | An example of an outcome matrix | 14 |
| 1a | Intercorrelation Matrix for the Four Interpersonal Attraction Scales | 49 |
| 2a | Mean Pretest Liking Ratings of the Rewarder | 50 |
| 2b | Analysis of the Pretest Liking Ratings of the Rewarder | 50 |
| 3a | Mean Pretest Liking Ratings of the Friend | 51 |
| 3b | Analysis of the Pretest Liking Ratings of the Friend | 51 |
| 4a | Mean Pretest Ratings of How Much Subjects Perceived the Rewarder to Like Them | 52 |
| 4b | Analysis of the Pretest Ratings of How Much Subjects Perceived the Rewarder to Like Them | 52 |
| 5a | Mean Pretest Ratings of How Much Subjects Perceived the Friend to Like Them | 53 |
| 5b | Analysis of the Pretest Ratings of How Much Subjects Perceived the Friend to Like Them | 53 |
| 6a | Mean Pretest Ratings of the Willingness to Work on Another Project with the Rewarder | 54 |
| 6b | Analysis of the Pretest Ratings of the Willingness to Work on Another Project with the Rewarder | 54 |
| 7a | Mean Pretest Ratings of the Willingness to Work on Another Project with the Friend | 55 |
| 7b | Analysis of the Pretest Ratings of the Willingness to Work on Another Project with the Friend | 55 |
| 8a | Mean Pretest Ratings of the Willingness to Meet the Rewarder Socially | 56 |
| 8b | Analysis of Pretest Ratings of the Willingness to Meet the Rewarder Socially | 56 |

| Table | | Page |
|-------|---|------|
| 9a | Mean Pretest Ratings of the Willingness to Meet the Friend Socially | 57 |
| 9b | Analysis of the Pretest Ratings of the Willingness to Meet the Friend Socially | 57 |
| 10a | Mean Pretest Ratings of the Rewarder Over All Twenty-two Bipolar Adjective Scales | 58 |
| 10b | Analysis of Pretest Ratings of the Rewarder Over All Twenty-two Bipolar Adjective Scales | 58 |
| 11a | Mean Change in Liking Scores of the Rewarder | 59 |
| 11b | Analysis of the Change in Liking Scores of the Rewarder | 59 |
| 12a | Mean Change in Liking Scores of the Friend | 60 |
| 12b | Analysis of Change in Liking Scores of the Friend ... | 60 |
| 12c | Analysis of Change in Liking Scores of the Friend for High Authoritarian Subjects | 61 |
| 12d | Analysis of Change in Liking Scores of the Friend for Low Authoritarian Subjects | 61 |
| 13a | Mean Change in the Subjects' Perception of How Much the Rewarder Likes Them | 62 |
| 13b | Analysis of the Change in the Subjects' Perception of the Rewarder's Liking for Them | 62 |
| 14a | Mean Change in the Subjects' Perception of How Much the Friend Likes Them | 63 |
| 14b | Analysis of the Change in the Subjects' Perception of the Friend's liking for Them | 63 |
| 15a | Mean Change in the Willingness to Participate in Another Project with the Rewarder | 64 |
| 15b | Analysis of Change in the Willingness to Participate in Another Project with the Rewarder | 64 |
| 16a | Mean Change in the Willingness to Participate in Another Project with the Friend | 65 |

| Table | | Page |
|-------|---|------|
| 16b | Analysis of Change in the Willingness to Participate in Another Project with the Friend | 65 |
| 17a | Mean Change in the Willingness to Meet the Rewarder Socially | 66 |
| 17b | Analysis of Change in the Willingness to Meet the Rewarder Socially | 66 |
| 18a | Mean Change in the Willingness to Meet the Friend Socially | 67 |
| 18b | Analysis of Change in the Willingness to Meet the Friend Socially | 67 |
| 19a | Mean Change Per Scale in the Overall Rating of the Rewarder | 68 |
| 19b | Analysis of Change in the Overall Rating of the Rewarder | 68 |
| 20a | Mean Percentage of Reward Received by the Rewarder Relative to the Friend Over Three Blocks of Trials (six trials per block) | 69 |
| 20b | Analysis of Percentage of Reward Received by the Rewarder Relative to the Friend Over Three Blocks of Trials (six trials per block) | 70 |

Introduction

It is a truism that a good deal of our impressions of others are based upon our interactions with them. But it is also a truism that interactions are generally complex events. Because of this, our impressions of others which result from an interaction with them could be potentially influenced by any of a number of factors. It seems reasonable, therefore, to determine what properties of an interaction are important in impression formation and how these properties interrelate.

All interactions can be characterized by at least three properties: (1) the personality of each participant, (2) the relative status of each participant, and (3) the behavior of the participants toward each other. A participant's behavior can itself be characterized by at least two sub-properties. First, the behavior can be directed at various other participants. Second, the behavior can vary as to its rewardingness. Of course in a dyadic interaction, the behavior of one is generally directed at the other. But in a triadic or larger interaction, any participant's behavior can be differentially directed. In particular, one participant of a triadic or larger group can differentially reward or punish one of the members at the expense of the other. And this behavior may have a significant effect on the perceptions of all participants (see Heider, 1958).

Interactions are generally defined in terms of behavior, but both personality and relative status are brought to them, and both are presumably influential in determining what behavior is produced (Schrauger & Altrocchi, 1964). In addition, it may be speculated

that both personality and relative status are influential in determining the perception of this behavior. Thus, a given behavioral act of one participant may be perceived by others differently according to the producer's status or according to the perceiver's personality. When, for example, a given behavioral act consists of a preferential rewarding in a group situation, both the personality and the relative status of the participants may have an effect on their interpretation of that act, and on their perceptions of each other. In order to gain a better understanding of the role of these three factors - personality, relative status, and reward - it is desirable to study them conjointly. This was the purpose of the present study. In particular, the present study attempted to determine how subjects varying on the personality trait of authoritarianism evaluated two others: a "friendly bystander" and an experimental confederate who systematically varied in his status and in the rewards he gave to the subject and bystander during a triadic interaction between them.

What should we expect the reaction of a high or low authoritarian person to be if he found himself being preferentially rewarded over another by a person of high or low status? And what should we expect if a high or low authoritarian found the other being preferentially rewarded over himself by the same high or low status person? How should he change his impressions of each, and how should his subsequent behavior towards them be affected? Unfortunately, little directly relevant research has been conducted. But much indirectly relevant research has. Part of this research has dealt with the effects of

reward on these impressions. And part has dealt with aggression and displacement. In the paragraphs to follow a review of the appropriate literature is given, and from this three hypotheses about the effects of authoritarianism, status and reward on liking are derived.

According to Adorno et al. (1950) a defining characteristic of the high authoritarian person, in contrast to the low authoritarian person, is his tendency towards an externalized relation to other people, liking those who are higher up in the social hierarchy and who conform to conventional standards, but, disliking those lower in the hierarchy. They found through both questionnaire data and clinical interviews that for the high authoritarian person, friendship was conceived of as a means of obtaining things rather than as a relationship based on mutuality in giving and taking. The high authoritarian person was concerned mainly with status and success and rather little concerned with solidarity and intimacy. He put friendship, love, and marriage in the service of status seeking. Anyone with whom he became intimate or even acquainted was evaluated in terms of his status.

Adorno et al. (1950) found that the low authoritarian person, on the other hand, tended to perceive others as essentially good until proven otherwise. Friends were not chosen because of their social positions but because of their personal qualities. The low authoritarian person looked for intrinsic worth in people instead of merely their external worth.

The Adorno et al. (1950) formulation has stimulated much experimental research in two-person situations. For example, Wilkins

and DeCharms (1962) did a study in which they manipulated internal and external power cues. By internal power cues, they meant the degree to which a person was decisive, self-confident, not afraid of responsibility, straight-forward, direct, and vigorous. By external power cues, they meant the social class a person belonged to. The results from the study indicated that high authoritarian subjects were not necessarily more sensitive to external power cues, but were more influenced by them in making inferences about other persons. Low authoritarian subjects, on the other hand, were less influenced by external power cues and used more internal factors in describing others.

Jones (1954), whose major concern was the relationship between authoritarianism and impression formation, found that high authoritarian subjects showed a greater tendency than low authoritarian subjects to differentiate their social environment in terms of power - or status - related concepts. Thus, for example, high authoritarian subjects differentiated between individuals more than low authoritarian subjects on such things as their purposefulness and ambition, their influence and power over peers, their income, and/or their occupation. In addition, he found that if the stimulus person was presented as a leader (and presumably a high status person), the high authoritarian person described him in more generally favorable terms than the low authoritarian person.

Thibaut and Riecken (1955) manipulated the status of a frustrator and found that high authoritarian subjects tended to reject a high status frustrator less than low authoritarian subjects. Conversely,

high authoritarian subjects tended to reject a low status frustrator more than low authoritarian subjects. In addition, they found that high authoritarian subjects liked the high status frustrator more than did the low authoritarian subjects; high authoritarian subject liked the low status frustrator less than did the low authoritarian subjects.

In summary, the research indicated that high authoritarian subjects liked more, and rated more favorably, a high status person, than did low authoritarian subjects. Conversely, high authoritarian subjects liked less, and rated less favorably, a low status person than did low authoritarian persons.

As explained previously, status is a potential factor in relationships between persons. Reward may also be a potential factor. It is generally accepted that a person will like another person more if rewarded by him than if he is not rewarded by him (Bramel, 1969). Byrne and Rhamey (1965), for example, manipulated information concerning a stranger's evaluation of subjects. They found that subjects increased their liking for the stranger when he evaluated them positively but decreased their liking for him when he evaluated them negatively.

From the previously mentioned research dealing with two persons - a high or low authoritarian subject and a high or low status stimulus person - it is known that high authoritarian subjects are status and/or authority conscious, whereas, low authoritarian subjects are not. However, it is not known what effect the status of a stimulus person has on a high or low authoritarian subject's liking relationship with a third person. Nor is it known what effect differential reward has

on a high or low authoritarian subject's liking relationship with a third person. A clue, however, can be derived from studies of the relation between authoritarianism and displacement of aggression.

From their clinical interviews, Adorno et al. (1950) conceived the relationship between authoritarianism and punitiveness to be mediated by social stimulus variables which were, for the most part, learned. More specifically, high authoritarian subjects, having presumably been reared in a very rigid and strict home environment, were assumed to have learned to avoid expressing overt and direct aggressiveness toward individuals perceived to be of higher status and instead, to displace this aggressiveness to out-group members, violators of conventional values, and low status persons in general. Conversely, low authoritarian persons, having presumably been reared in a permissive or relaxed home environment, were assumed to have been allowed to express their aggressiveness toward the object of their frustration regardless of its status. Roberts and Jessor (1958) found that when high authoritarian subjects were frustrated, high authoritarian subjects more often than low authoritarian subjects tended to respond with personal hostility to frustrators of low status and with indirect or displaced hostility to frustrators of high status. However, low authoritarian subjects responded to frustrators independently of their status.

It is the condition wherein the third person receives more reward than the subject, at which time the stimulus person may be seen as a frustrator by the subject, that aggression presumably becomes important as a reaction to the status of the stimulus person. The

low authoritarian subject should direct his aggression against the stimulus person regardless of his status and would not displace it onto the third person. This would suggest the liking relationship between the low authoritarian subject and the third person would continue or, in any case, the subject's displaced aggression would not be the reason for its decrease. This prediction is strengthened by the previously mentioned two-person research which demonstrated that low authoritarian subjects establish relationships with other persons on the basis of those persons' internal, personal qualities. This would seem to provide a firmer basis for the prediction that the liking relationship would continue in the described condition.

In contrast, when the high authoritarian subject is rewarded less than the third person and therefore presumably perceiving the stimulus person as a frustrator, the status of the stimulus person should take on greater importance. If the stimulus person is high status, the high authoritarian subject will not aggress directly against him but will displace his aggression onto the third person, thereby decreasing the liking relationship. However, if the stimulus person is low status, the high authoritarian subject will feel free to aggress directly against him. In this case it would seem the liking relationship between the subject and the third person might possibly continue. However, Adorno et al. (1950) found that high authoritarian subjects tended to carry their feelings of rivalry into every relationship. Therefore, even if they didn't displace their aggression onto the third person, their feelings of rivalry towards someone who was

getting ahead of them in rewards would tend to decrease their liking for the third person.

If a subject receives more reward from the stimulus person than does the third person, aggression is presumably not present since the stimulus person is acting as a rewarder and not as a frustrator. As stated earlier, low authoritarian subjects form relationships on the basis of internal, personal qualities and therefore, external factors such as status and reward would have very little effect on the liking relationship between the low authoritarian subject and the third person. Therefore, regardless of which of the two is rewarded and regardless of the status of the stimulus person, the liking relationship with the third person should continue. However, if the high authoritarian subject receives more reward than the third person, then the status of the stimulus person will perhaps have an effect on the subject's liking relationship with the third person. That is, the element of rivalry would be removed and the high authoritarian subject's status consciousness would have an effect. Therefore, if the stimulus person is of high status, the high authoritarian subject would respect his judgment of the third person. The fact that the stimulus person is not rewarding the third person could be taken as an indication that his evaluation of the third person is rather low. Accordingly, the subject's liking of the third person would be decreased. If the stimulus person is of low status, the high authoritarian subject would not like him and would continue to like the third person who was of a status similar to his own.

To test the experimental hypothesis, the present experiment was designed to simulate a situation in which there were two persons, the subject and the female confederate (hereafter referred to as the Friend), who had established a friendly or "liking" relationship, and a third person (the male confederate hereafter referred to as the Rewarder, who is an outsider varying in status and who differentially rewards one of the two persons).

The hypotheses were:

1. That high authoritarian subjects would like more, and also describe in more generally favorable terms, a high status Rewarder than would low authoritarian subjects; high authoritarian subjects would like less, and also describe in more generally unfavorable terms, a low status Rewarder than would low authoritarian subjects,
2. That subjects would increase their liking for the Rewarder if he rewarded them but would decrease their liking if he didn't reward them, and perhaps most importantly,
3. That low authoritarian subjects' liking for the Friend would continue regardless of the status of the Rewarder or how much more or less the Rewarder was giving them relative to the Friend, whereas, the high authoritarian subjects' liking for the Friend would be determined by both these factors. In other words, it was predicted that when high authoritarian subjects were rewarded by a low status Rewarder, the initial

liking for the Friend would continue, whereas, if they were rewarded by a high status Rewarder, the initial liking for the Friend would be decreased. No matter whether the Rewarder was high or low status, high authoritarian subjects would decrease their initial liking for the Friend if they were not rewarded.

Subjects' liking for the Rewarder and Friend was determined both before and after the reward manipulation by means of rating scales. But, in addition, subsequent to the post-manipulation ratings, subjects were given an opportunity to differentially reward the others. The reasons for including this were exploratory. Differential liking could presumably reveal itself in differential rewards, and if the former did occur it seemed of interest to see whether or not the latter would occur as well. No specific hypotheses concerning the relation between authoritarianism, status and reward upon the subjects' own rewarding behavior were made.

METHOD

Subjects

Sixty-four subjects were selected from a pool of 303 Introductory Psychology students at the University of Alberta who completed the 28-item F scale (Adorno et al, 1950) prior to the experimental session (see Appendix A). Each item was given a score ranging from 5 points (for a response indicating strong agreement with it) to 1 point (for a response indicating strong disagreement with it). The resulting scores for the total sample ranged from 37 to 109 with a median of 73. Separate distributions were found for males and females; that of the males ranged from 37 to 107 with a median of 75, while that of the females ranged from 41 to 109 with a median of 68.

The male and female distributions were each divided into thirds. Sixteen males and 16 females were then randomly selected from each of the upper and lower thirds of their respective distributions. The resulting 64 subjects (32 high authoritarian and 32 low authoritarian) were randomly assigned to the experimental conditions with the restriction that an equal number of males and females were included in each condition as a control for sex effects. The high authoritarian group had a median F-scale score of 94 while the low authoritarian group had a median score of 55.

Subjects who participated did so to partially fulfill experiment requirements for an introductory psychology course. Each was run singly in one 1-hour session.

Design

Two levels of authoritarianism (high vs. low), two levels of reward (reward to subject vs. reward to "Friend"), and two levels of Rewarder status (high vs. low), were combined in a 2 x 2 x 2 factorial design. Authoritarianism was varied by selecting subjects from upper and lower thirds of the obtained distribution of F-scale scores as mentioned above. Reward was varied by programming a male confederate (Rewarder) to make choices in three-person decomposed games (see Messick & McClintock, 1968) in such a way as to preferentially reward the subject or a female confederate (Friend). Status of the Rewarder was manipulated by varying the information given to the subject about his background.

Apparatus and Materials

The experimental room contained two tables placed in a T-formation, four chairs, a projector table and a projector. The three participants (subject, Friend, and Rewarder) all sat at one side of a table but were visually isolated by two moveable barriers (2' X 2') which divided the common table into three separate booths. In each participant's booth there were two cards, one marked "A" and one marked "B". In addition, identification cards with either "Person I", "Person II", or "Person III" marked on them were ready to be placed in front of the Rewarder, subject, and Friend, respectively. The experimenter sat facing the participants at the end of the table which formed the upright of the "T". One hundred and eighty red, white and blue poker chips, used to indicate cumulative reward in the game portion of the

experiment, were piled in front of the experimenter and were visible to all three participants.

Twenty-two 7 point bi-polar adjective scales were used to measure how each participant perceived the other members of the group. Four additional scales were used to measure how attracted they were to one another (see Appendix B). To control for response bias, thirteen of the twenty-two scales were randomly selected to be placed in a positive-to-negative direction such that a score of 7 was extremely negative, a score of 1 was extremely positive. The remaining nine scales were in a negative-to-positive direction such that a score of 7 indicated extreme positiveness and a score of 1 indicated extreme negativeness.

The Games. Three-person decomposed games (adapted from Messick & McClintock, 1968) were used first to manipulate reward and second, to measure subject's reaction to this reward manipulation. Each game set consisted of eighteen trials. On each trial, a different outcome matrix was projected on the wall which the subjects were facing. In making up the different outcome matrices, only the numbers 0 to 4 were used. Each was constructed so that Person I's outcomes were held constant over choice A and choice B, and what varied were the outcomes for Person II and Person III (see Appendix C). An example of an outcome matrix is shown in Table 1. In the example, a choice of alternative A would give Person I three poker chips, Person II four poker chips, and Person III one poker chip. A choice of alternative B would give Person I three poker chips, Person II one poker chip,

Table 1
An example of an outcome matrix

| | A | B |
|------------|---|---|
| Person I | 3 | 3 |
| Person II | 4 | 1 |
| Person III | 1 | 4 |

and Person III four poker chips, (the procedure for how the choices were made is presented below). Since Person I received a fixed amount in each game no matter what choice was made, the number of poker chips that Person I won was 47. However, since Person II and Person III could receive varying amounts within each game, the total number of poker chips Person II could win ranged from 24 to 49 and the total number of poker chips Person III could win ranged from 22 to 49.

The eighteen matrices were photographed singly and made into 35 mm. slides. A Kodak 35 mm. rotary slide projector was used to show the matrices during the game sets.

Procedure

Each subject was run with two experimental confederates, the Friend and the Rewarder. Person I, the Rewarder, was a male confederate and Person II, the Friend, a female confederate. The three participants (subject, Friend and Rewarder) were brought together ostensibly for the study of how information about others would be used to predict choices that the others would make in experimental games.

The experiment had six major phases which were, in chronological order: (1) introduction of the subject and Friend; (2) the status manipulation; (3) the pretest rating; (4) the reward manipulation; (5) the post-test rating; and (6) the choice measure. Each phase is outlined separately below.

Introduction of Subject and Friend. Before the experiment proper began, an attempt was made to establish a liking relationship between the subject and the confederate called the Friend. In order to accomplish this, the Friend, by instruction, was waiting in the waiting room when the subject arrived. They were left together in the waiting room for approximately five minutes. During this time, the Friend initiated conversation with the subject and acted in a generally friendly manner. The experimenter then entered, introduced himself, and escorted both of them into the experimental room, casually commenting on the fact that the other participant (the Rewarder) had not yet appeared. Upon entering the experimental room, the Friend always made certain to sit in the middle chair, forcing the subject to sit at either end. Both were then given experimental participation cards to fill out so that they would get course credit for the experiment.

At this point, the Rewarder entered the waiting room. The experimenter brought him to the experimental room where he was immediately given an experiment participation card to fill out. As soon as the cards were completed, the signs with either Person I, Person II, or Person III printed on them were placed in front of the Rewarder, Friend, and subject, respectively. These served to clarify

to the subject what he or she and the other two participants were receiving during the game portion of the experiment. The sign, in essence, became the participant's "name"; subsequent to giving it, all references to the participants were made in terms of their given number.

The instructions were then read to the participants. They explained the intentions of the experiment and outlined the events and procedure to follow (see Appendix D).

The Status Manipulation. Because the participants were told, as was stated earlier, that the purpose of the experiment was to study how information about others would be used to predict choices that the others would make in experimental games, all were asked a series of questions which were designed to supply them with a little information about each other. The six questions were: (1) What is your father's occupation? (2) What level of education do both your mother and father have? (3) What is your faculty and major, and would you have fallen in the Pass, Second Class, or First Class range in your last year of school? (4) What are your vocational objectives? (5) Why are you taking Psychology? (6) What is your opinion of T-groups or sensitivity training? The subject was always asked to answer first; the Friend, listening very carefully to the subject's answers, answered next giving similar answers (this was done in order to increase the liking relationship between the subject and Friend). The Rewarder answered last, giving one set of answers when he was to be high status, and another set of answers when he was to be low status (see Appendix E).

Pretest Ratings. At this point, the experimenter visually separated the participants from each other by placing the two barriers between the subject and Friend and between the Friend and Rewarder. Each was then given two copies of the twenty-six rating scales, and each was asked to complete an evaluation of the other two persons. It was explained that impressions of others affected predictive accuracy and that in order to control for this, it was necessary to be aware of these impressions. Upon completion, the evaluations were collected by the experimenter.

Reward Manipulation. Instructions for the three-person game were now given. It was explained that the experimenter would choose one person in the group to make the choices and that it was the job of the other two members to try and predict which of the two choices, A or B, this person would make. The A and B cards, in front of each participant, were to be used for indicating to the experimenter the choice and predictions made. After the choice and predictions were made, the experimenter used his A and B cards to indicate to the participants the choice made. It was emphasized that the numbers in the different cells of the outcome matrices were to be considered imaginary amounts of money. In addition, it was explained that in order for the subjects to observe how much each was receiving cumulatively, the experimenter would pile up the appropriate number of poker chips for each person in plain view of everybody.

The experimenter explained that all three persons would have their turn in the role of Chooser in a game set. Person I, the high or low status Rewarder, was asked to be Chooser for the first game set.

During the eighteen trials on which the Rewarder was choosing, he preferentially rewarded either the subject or Friend using a pre-determined strategy. When the subject was being preferentially rewarded (reward condition), the total number of poker chips he won was 49, while the Friend and Rewarder won 31 and 47 poker chips, respectively. When the Friend was being preferred, (nonreward condition), the total number of poker chips the subject won was 30, while the Friend and Rewarder won 48 and 47, respectively.

Post-test Ratings. Rating scales were again supplied and each participant was asked to evaluate the other two. The reason given this time was that the experimenter had to control for their impressions of each other before the second game set. Upon completion, the evaluations were collected by the experimenter.

Choice Measures. After completing the post-test ratings, the subject was asked to be the Chooser. At this time the signs of the three participants were changed so that the subject became Person I, the Friend remained Person II, and the Rewarder became Person III. The eighteen games were then shown in an identical manner to that of the reward manipulation phase but in reversed order. Upon completion of these eighteen trials, the session was terminated. The two confederates were sent out of the room and the subject was informed of the true intentions of the experiment, fully debriefed, and asked to maintain secrecy until completion of the study in about one month's time.

RESULTS

Pretest Ratings

The data to be considered first were the pretest ratings of the Rewarder and the Friend given by high and low authoritarian subjects. Each of the four interpersonal attraction scales (see Appendix D) was analyzed separately using a $2 \times 2 \times 2$ analysis of variance. Separate analyses were performed on the data for the Rewarder and the Friend. Means and summary tables of the analysis appear in Appendix H. A low score indicated an unfavorable evaluation, a high score a favorable evaluation.

Intercorrelations of the four interpersonal attraction scales.

Subjects' evaluations on the liking scale (Scale 1), the perceived liking scale (Scale 2), experimental participation scale (Scale 3), and the meet socially scale (Scale 4) were intercorrelated across the Rewarder and the Friend. Table 1a contains the intercorrelation matrix. It can be seen from Table 1a that all four scales correlate with each other.

Liking Scale. Table 2a contains the mean liking for the Rewarder. The results of an analysis of variance of these evaluations, shown in Table 2b, point to a number of conclusions. First, when the Rewarder was high status, he was liked more than when he was low status. The means were 5.1 and 4.5 respectively. Second, a significant Authoritarianism-by-Status interaction was found. High authoritarian subjects liked the Rewarder more than the low authoritarian subjects when he was high status but liked him less than the low authoritarian subjects when he was low status. Third, the three-

way interaction between authoritarianism, status and reward was significant. For high authoritarian subjects, the difference between their liking of a high and low status Rewarder was greater if he was about to reward them than when he wasn't. For low authoritarian subjects, the low status Rewarder was liked more than the high status Rewarder if he was not about to reward them whereas the reverse was true when he was.

To assess the effect of the status of the Rewarder on the subjects' liking for the Friend, an analysis of variance was performed on the pretest evaluations of the Friend on the first scale. Table 3a contains the mean liking scores for the Friend and Table 3b contains a summary of the analysis of variance. Over all subjects, when the Rewarder was high status, the Friend was liked more than when the Rewarder was low status. The means were 5.94 and 5.47 respectively. No other main effects or interactions were significant.

Perceived Liking Scale. The results of an analysis of variance on the subjects' pretest ratings of how much they perceived the Rewarder to like them revealed a significant three-way interaction. Table 4a contains the mean perceived-liking ratings and Table 4b contains a summary of the analysis of variance. If they were not about to be rewarded, high authoritarian subjects perceived the Rewarder to like them more if he was low status than if he was high status, whereas, the reverse was true if they were about to be rewarded. In contrast, low authoritarian subjects, if they were not about to be rewarded, perceived the Rewarder to like them more if he was high status than if he was low status, whereas, the reverse was

true if they were about to be rewarded. No other main effects or interactions were significant.

An analysis of variance was also performed on the subjects' pre-test evaluation of how much they thought the Friend liked them. Table 5a contains the mean ratings and Table 5b contains a summary of the analysis of variance. The three-way interaction was found to approach significance. If they were about to be rewarded, high authoritarian subjects perceived the Friend to like them more when the Rewarder was low status than when he was high status, whereas, the reverse was true if they were about to be rewarded. No matter whether they were about to be rewarded or not, low authoritarian subjects perceived the Friend to like them more if the Rewarder was high status than if he was low status. No other main effects or interactions were significant.

Experimental Participation Scale. The results of an analysis of variance for the pretest ratings of the willingness to work on another project with the Rewarder, shown in Table 6b, point to a number of conclusions. Table 6a contains the mean willingness ratings. First, high authoritarian subjects were more willing than low authoritarian subjects to work on another project with a high status Rewarder, but were less willing than low authoritarian subjects to work on another project with a low status Rewarder. Second, low authoritarian subjects were more willing than high authoritarian subjects to work on another project with the Rewarder if he was about to reward them, but were less willing than high authoritarian subjects to work on another project with the Rewarder if he was not about to reward them.

An analysis of variance was performed on the subjects' pretest ratings of their willingness to work on another project with the Friend. Table 7a contains the mean ratings and Table 7b contains a summary of the analysis of variance. No significant main effects or interactions were found.

Meet Socially Scale. An analysis of variance was performed on the pretest ratings of the willingness to meet the Rewarder socially. Table 8a contains the mean ratings and Table 8b contains a summary of the analysis of variance. No main effects or interactions were found to be significant.

An analysis of variance performed on the pretest ratings of the willingness to meet the Friend socially, shown in Table 9b, yielded no significant main effects or interactions. Table 9a contains the mean willingness ratings.

The remaining scales. Since the remaining twenty-two scales were included to assess a subject's "overall" evaluation of the Rewarder, pretest evaluation scores of the Rewarder were totalled over all scales for each subject and a $2 \times 2 \times 2$ analysis of variance performed. Table 10a contains the mean ratings and Table 10b contains a summary of the analysis of variance. The high status Rewarder was perceived more positively overall than the low status Rewarder. The means were 5.2 and 4.4 respectively. Also, the three-way interaction was found to be significant. For high authoritarian subjects, the difference between the perceived favorableness of the high and low status Rewarder was greater if they were about to be rewarded than if

they were not, whereas, the reverse was true for the low authoritarian subjects. No other main effects or interactions were significant.

Post-test Ratings

The pretest ratings were taken after the status manipulation but before the reward manipulation. However, as was evident in several of the analyses of the pretest ratings, groups in the reward or non-reward condition differed significantly from each other even though reward had not yet been manipulated. This was particularly evident in the obtained significant three-way interaction found in the analyses of the liking and perceived liking scale for the Rewarder, and the perceived liking scale for the Friend. In addition, the Authoritarian-by-Reward interaction was found to be significant in the analysis of the pretest ratings on the experimental participation scale for the Rewarder. Therefore, any conclusions based on the post-test ratings of those scales after reward had been manipulated would be obfuscated by these significant interactions. It was decided, therefore, to limit discussion of the post-test ratings only to the changes in scale ratings which occurred between pretest and post-test. The mean changes in ratings from pretest to post-test and the analyses of variance tables also appear in Appendix H.

Liking Scale. An analysis of variance was performed on the change in liking scores of the Rewarder. Table 11a contains the mean changes and Table 11b contains a summary of the analysis of variance. A significant reward main effect was found. When both high and low authoritarian subjects were rewarded, they changed their liking for the Rewarder in a positive direction, whereas, when they were not

rewarded, they changed in a negative direction. The mean change scores were .11 and -1.22 respectively.

To assess the effect of reward on the liking for the Friend, an analysis of variance was performed on the change scores of Scale 1. Table 12a contains the mean changes and Table 12b contains a summary of the analysis of variance. A significant three-way interaction was found. In the nonreward condition, high authoritarian subjects changed their liking of the Friend in a positive direction when the Rewarder was low status but they changed their liking in a negative direction when he was high status. The reverse was true under the condition of reward. Under non-reward, low authoritarian subjects changed their liking of the Friend in a negative direction when the Rewarder was low status, but didn't change their liking when he was high status. The reverse was true under the condition of reward. To test for more specific results, the triple interaction was broken down and a separate 2 x 2 analysis of variance was performed for both high and low authoritarian subjects (see Tables 12c and 12d). The interaction for the high authoritarian subjects was found to contribute most of the variance to the significant three-way interaction; the Status-by-Reward interaction for the high authoritarian subjects was significant, whereas, the same interaction for the low authoritarian subjects was not significant.

Perceived Liking Scale. To determine the effect of reward on how much the subjects perceived the Rewarder to like them, an analysis of variance was performed on the perceived liking change scores. Table 13a contains the mean change scores and Table 13b contains a

summary of the analysis of variance. Only a significant reward main effect was found. All subjects changed their rating of the Rewarder's liking for them in a positive direction if he rewarded them and in a negative direction if he didn't reward them. The mean change scores were .55 and -.78 respectively.

An analysis of variance was performed on the subjects' change in perception of the Friend's liking for them. Table 14a contains the mean change scores and Table 14b contains a summary of the analysis of variance. No significant main effects of interactions were found.

Experimental Participation Scale. To assess the effect of reward on the subjects' willingness to work on another project with the Rewarder, an analysis of variance was performed on the change scores of this scale. Table 15a contains the mean change scores and Table 15b contains a summary of the analysis of variance. Here too, a significant reward main effect was found. The willingness of all subjects to work on another project with the Rewarder changed little from the pretest rating when they were rewarded, but changed in a negative direction when they were not rewarded. The means were .02 and -.87 respectively.

An analysis of variance was performed on the change of ratings in the willingness to participate in another project with the Friend. Table 16a contains the mean change scores and Table 16b contains a summary of the analysis of variance. No main effects or interactions were found to be significant.

Meet Socially Scale. To determine the effect of reward on subjects' willingness to meet with the Rewarder socially, an analysis

of variance was performed on the change scores of Scale 4. Table 17a contains the mean change scores and Table 17b contains a summary of the analysis of variance. Once more a significant reward main effect was found. When rewarded, subjects changed in a positive direction and became more willing to meet the Rewarder socially but when not rewarded, the subjects changed in a negative direction and became less willing. The means were .25 and -.66 respectively.

An analysis of variance was performed on the change of ratings in the willingness to meet the Friend socially. Table 18a contains the mean change scores and Table 18b contains a summary of the analysis of variance. No significant main effect or interactions were found.

The remaining scales. To assess the effect of reward on the perception of the high or low status Rewarder overall twenty-two bipolar adjectives, an analysis of variance was performed on the total change scores. Table 19a contains the mean change scores and Table 19b contains a summary of the analysis of variance. A significant reward main effect was found. If the Rewarder rewarded the subjects, their overall evaluation remained relatively the same as on the pretest evaluation, but if he didn't reward them, they changed their overall evaluation in a negative direction. The mean change per scale was .04 and -.42 respectively.

Behavioral Data

In order to determine whether authoritarianism, status, or reward had any effect upon subjects' choice behavior in the second game set, the differences between the Rewarder's and the Friend's reward after six, twelve, and eighteen trials were calculated. These

were used as an index of the subject's preference or greater liking for one of the other two persons. For example, if after 18 trials the subject has given the Friend forty-five poker chips and the Rewarder thirty-two, then it could be said that the subject preferred or was more attracted towards the Friend.

A $2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 3$ analysis of variance was performed on the above differences. Table 20a contains the mean differences over trials and Table 20b contains a summary of the analysis of variance. Only a significant reward main effect was found. If the subjects were rewarded, they tended to increase the reward to the Rewarder relative to the Friend, whereas, if they were not rewarded, they decreased the reward to the Rewarder relative to the Friend. That is, if the subjects were rewarded, they gave the Rewarder 101% of the reward relative to the Friend, whereas, if they were not rewarded, they gave the Rewarder 99% of the reward relative to the Friend. The difference, though significant, was not considered to be large.

Discussion

The main purpose of this study was to investigate the effect that the relationship between a high or low authoritarian subject and a high or low status person (Rewarder) has on an established liking relationship between the subject and a third person (Friend). Specifically, it was the purpose of this study to investigate the effect of the Rewarder's status and differential reward on the liking relationship between the high or low authoritarian subject and the Friend. It was predicted that low authoritarian subjects would continue their initial liking of the Friend regardless of how much more or less the Rewarder was giving them relative to the Friend and regardless of the status of the Rewarder. In contrast, it was predicted that high authoritarian subjects' liking for the Friend would be determined by both status of the Rewarder and how much more or less the Rewarder was giving them relative to the Friend.

The prediction for the low authoritarian subjects was supported. Low authoritarian subjects' liking for the Friend was not significantly affected by the status of the Rewarder or reward itself. This finding is consistent with Adorno et al. (1950) finding that low authoritarian persons desired intimacy with others, looking for internal rather than external qualities in people, and Wilkins and DeCharms' (1962) finding that low authoritarian persons were less influenced by external power cues and were more sensitive to internal factors.

The prediction for the high authoritarian subjects, however, was not confirmed. Reward and status of the Rewarder did have an effect

on high authoritarian subjects' liking for the Friend. However, the effect was opposite to that predicted. It was found that when the Rewarder was high status, differential reward had little or no effect on high authoritarian subjects' liking for the Friend. Their liking for him continued at relatively the same level as before reward. However, when the Rewarder was low status, differential reward had a great effect on high authoritarian subjects' liking for the Friend. They increased their liking for the Friend when the Friend was rewarded but they decreased their liking for the Friend when they were rewarded themselves.

The reasons for the above finding are not clear, though a number of different attempts were made to explain the finding, none of which were acceptable to the author. It seems impossible to arrive at an immediate explanation in terms of the theory of the authoritarian personality. However, the findings do seem to indicate the possibility of an explanation in terms of perceptual processes.

In order to pursue a perception-oriented explanation of the above finding, it is necessary to reconsider the assumption upon which the hypothesis in question was made. The hypothesis was based on the assumption that high and low authoritarian subjects would perceive the experimental situation in the same way, but would bring different values to bear upon it. Since the predictions based on this assumption were not upheld, the assumption must be questioned. If, in fact, this assumption is not true then there seem to be two possible alternatives. The first alternative could be that high and low authoritarian subjects

had the same values for the situation but perceived the situation differently. Their different perceptions would in turn lead to the unpredicted behaviors. Kelley and Stehelski (1970) found that in a gaming situation, high authoritarian subjects perceived their opponent unfavorably regardless of whether the opponent played cooperatively or competitively. Low authoritarian subjects, on the other hand, perceived the cooperative opponent favorably but perceived the competitive opponent unfavorably. The investigators concluded that high and low authoritarian subjects did, in fact, differ in terms of their perceptions of given situations.

There are several findings in the present study, as well, which also hint at the idea that there are perceptual differences between high and low authoritarian persons. First, low authoritarian subjects did not change their liking for the Friend when the Rewarder varied in status and when reward was varied, whereas, high authoritarian subjects did. This may be due to the fact that high and low authoritarian subjects weighed the cues of reward and status differently when combining them to form an impression. Second, certain interactions in the pretest ratings were found to be significant that were not predicted, namely, the three-way interactions on three of the four interpersonal attraction scales. Reward had not yet been manipulated and yet the different experimental groups varied as if it had. These findings can possibly be explained in terms of experimenter bias in that although the confederates ran blind, the experimenter did not. It could be argued then that the experimenter elicited some subtle

nonverbal cues which influenced the groups in different ways. However, before the pretest ratings no mention of reward or the game was made, thereby, reducing the possibility of tipping the subjects off through the instructions. These significant three-way interactions also might possibly be explained in terms of the perceptual process. Since the status manipulation took place prior to the pretest ratings, it may have affected the way the subjects combined the various cues available to them in the situation in the formation of their impressions of the other persons in the group.

The study by Kelley and Stehelski (1970) together with the discussed aspects of the present study would seem to indicate that there is some support for the idea that high and low authoritarian subjects differ in their perceptions of given situations. However, the assumption stated as possible, namely, that high and low authoritarian subjects had the same values for the situation but perceived the situation differently, must still be questioned on the grounds that it has been demonstrated that high and low authoritarian persons do not, in fact, have the same values (Adorno et al., 1950).

In general, the preceding discussion seems to lead to the conclusion that though there are differences in the values of high and low authoritarian subjects, these differences may not entirely account for the differences in their perceptions of others. Their perception of the situation must also be taken into account. Therefore, a more valid assumption upon which to base the predictions in question would be that high and low authoritarian subjects not only have different

values but also perceive the situation differently. However, it would be the task of further research to explicate this matter.

Some support was found for the prediction that high authoritarian subjects would like a high status Rewarder more than low authoritarian subjects and that they would like a low status Rewarder less than low authoritarian subjects both before and after reward. In the pretest data, the relevant interaction was significant and in the predicted direction on the liking scale and the experimental participation scale but not on the meet socially scale (though the means were in the predicted direction). This finding is fairly consistent with other research in which it was found that high authoritarian subjects were more status conscious, liking those higher up in the social hierarchy and disliking those lower down in the hierarchy (Adorno et al., 1950; Jones, 1954, Thibaut & Riecken, 1955; Wilkins & DeCharms, 1962). The only inconsistency is the fact that the data didn't show the predicted dislike for the low status Rewarder. This could be explained in either of two ways. Either the subjects were hesitant to use the lower end of the rating scale or the low status Rewarder was not perceived as being of a truly low status, as would be indicated by the fact that their ratings of him were largely neutral.

The fact that no change occurred in the Authoritarianism-by Status interaction in the above scales after reward was manipulated indicated that all subjects were maintaining the status differentiation found in the pretest ratings.

The prediction that high authoritarian subjects would describe

a high status person in more generally favorable terms and would describe a low status person in more generally unfavorable terms than low authoritarian subjects was not confirmed. This result is contrary to other studies which have found the predicted interaction (Adorno et al., 1950; Jones, 1954). One explanation for this is that in the present study the Rewarder's status was established more on a competency level than on a social level. Jones (1954), for example, manipulated status in terms of personal power and attitudes towards leadership. In the present study, the status of the Rewarder was described in terms of his academic achievements and vocational objectives. The status of his family was described in these terms as well. Where a high status person is considered a person of high competence, it would seem more likely that he would earn the respect of both high and low authoritarian subjects. Conversely, the low status person who is seen, in effect, as incompetent, is less likely to earn the respect of either. The lack of differences could also be due to the rating scales themselves. Very few traits that would differentiate between high and low authoritarian subjects, such as leader or power traits, were included.

The prediction that all subjects would like the Rewarder if he rewarded them but would like him less if he didn't was confirmed. This finding is consistent with a great deal of research that indicates that when a person rewards another person, he is liked more by that person than if he does not reward him (Byrne and Rhamey, 1965; Bramel, 1969).

Of interest also was the relationship between the subject's ratings on the four interpersonal attraction scales and his choice behavior. Perhaps the interactions found in the ratings did not mirror themselves in the choice behavior because in the experimental situation, subjects knew that both the Friend and Rewarder were aware of the choices they were making. Therefore, there could be some social pressure keeping them from seeming to degrade a person who was low already or to appear to be social climbers, clinging to the high status person. In contrast, because the ratings were made privately, subjects may have felt less constraint to indicate their honest feelings.

There was one problem which could have had an effect on a great many of the results: no subjects with really extreme authoritarianism scores were available from the pool. The highest score on the F-scale did not reach the mean F-scale score for high authoritarian subjects of earlier studies (Crockett and Meidinger, 1956; Jones, 1954; Lipetz, 1960; Rabinowitz, 1956; Roberts and Jessor, 1958; Scodel and Freedman, 1965; Scodel and Mussen, 1953; Steiner and Johnson, 1963; Thibaut & Riecken, 1955; and Wilkins and DeCharms, 1962). Since the 28 items on the authoritarian measure used came from the original scale, it could be that some of them no longer mean what they used to. For example, the view that homosexuality is more of an illness than a punishable offense has been promoted in society to an extent where even high authoritarian persons are likely to have been affected by it.

An important implication of the present study is that several properties of an interaction, specifically authoritarianism, relative status, and reward, do have an effect on impression formation. Moreover, the present study implies that these factors influence impression formation not only as single entities but in interaction with each other.

REFERENCES

- Adorno, T.W., Frenkel-Brunswik, Else, Levinson, D.J., and Sanford, R.N. The Authoritarian Personality. New York: Harper, 1950.
- Bramel, D. Interpersonal attraction, hostility, and perception. In J. Mills' (Ed.). Experimental Social Psychology. Toronto: The MacMillan Company Collier-MacMillan Canada, 1969, 3-32.
- Byrne, D. and Rhamey, R. Magnitude of positive and negative reinforcements as a determinant of attraction. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 2, 884-889.
- Crockett, W.H. and Meidinger, T. Authoritarianism and interpersonal perception. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1956, 53, 378-380.
- Foulkes, D. and Foulkes, S.H. Self-concept, dogmatism, and intolerance of trait-inconsistency. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 2, 104-110.
- Heider, F. The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations. New York: Wiley, 1958.
- Jones, E.E. Authoritarianism as a determinant of first impression formation. Journal of Personality, 1954, 23, 107-127.
- Kates, S.L. First impression formation and authoritarianism. Human Relations, 1959, 12, 277-286.
- Kelley, H.H. and Stahelski, A.J. Errors in perception of intentions in a mixed motive game. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1970, 6, 379-400.

- Klein, G.S., and Schlesinger, H. Where is the perceiver in perceptual theory? Journal of Personality, 1949, 18, 32-48.
- Lipetz, M.E. The effects of information on assessment of attitudes by authoritarians and nonauthoritarians. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1960, 60, 95-99.
- Long, B.H. and Ziller, R.C. Dogmatism and predecisional information search. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1965, 49, 376-378.
- Messick, D.M. and McClintock, C.G. Motivational bases of choice in experimental games. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1968, 4, 1-25.
- Pettigrew, T.F. The measurement and correlates of category width as a cognitive variable. Journal of Personality, 1958, 26, 532-544.
- Plant, W.T., Telford, C.W., and Thomas, J.H. Some personality differences between dogmatic and nondogmatic groups. Journal of Social Psychology, 1965, 67, 67-75.
- Rabinowitz, W. A note on the social perceptions of authoritarians and nonauthoritarians. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1956, 53, 384-386.
- Roberts, A.H. and Jessor, R. Authoritarianism, punitiveness, and perceived social status. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1958, 56, 311-314.
- Rokeach, M. The open and closed mind. New York: Basic Books, 1960.
- Shrauger, S. and Altrocchi, J. The personality of the perceiver as a factor in person perception. Psychological Bulletin, 1964, 62, 289-308.

- Scodel, A. and Freedman, M.L. Additional observations on the social perceptions of authoritarians and nonauthoritarians. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1956, 52, 92-95.
- Scodel, A. and Mussen, P. Social perceptions of authoritarians and nonauthoritarians. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1953, 48, 181-184.
- Steiner, I.D. and Johnson, H.H. Authoritarianism and tolerance of trait inconsistency. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, 67, 388-391.
- Tagiuri, R. Person Perception. In G. Lindzey and E. Aronson's (Eds.). The Handbook of Social Psychology, (2nd ed.), Vol. 3, 395-449. Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley, 1969.
- Thibaut, J.W. and Riecken, H.W. Authoritarianism, status and the communication of aggression. Human Relations, 1955, 8, 95-120.
- White, B.J., Alter, R.D., and Rardin, M. Authoritarianism, dogmatism, and usage of conceptual categories. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 2, 293-295.
- Wilkins, E.J. and DeCharms, R. Authoritarianism and response to power cues. Journal of Personality, 1962, 30, 439-458.

APPENDIX A
CALIFORNIA F SCALE ITEMS

1. Obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn.
2. Science has its place, but there are many important things that can never possibly be understood by the human mind.
3. A person who has bad manners, habits and breeding can hardly expect to get along with decent people.
4. When a person has a problem or worry, it is best for him not to think about it, but to keep busy with more cheerful things.
5. Every person should have complete faith in some supernatural power whose decisions he obeys without question.
6. No weakness or difficulty can hold us back if we have enough will power.
7. Human nature being what it is, there will always be war and conflict.
8. Nowadays when so many different kinds of people move around and mix together so much, a person has to protect himself especially carefully against catching an infection or disease from them.
9. If people would talk less and work more, everybody would be better off.
10. Young people get rebellious ideas sometimes, but as they grow up they ought to get over them and settle down.
11. What the youth needs most is strict discipline, rugged determination, and the will to work and fight for family and country.
12. Nowadays more and more people are prying into matters that should remain personal and private.
13. Some people are born with the urge to jump from high places.
14. An insult to our honor should always be punished.
15. Familiarity breeds contempt.
16. Wars and social troubles may some day be ended by an earthquake or flood that will destroy the whole world.

17. Sex crimes, such as rape and attacks on children, deserve more than mere imprisonment; such criminals ought to be publicly whipped or worse.
18. The businessman and the manufacturer are much more important to society than the artist and the professor.
19. What this country needs most, more than laws and political programs, is a few courageous, tireless, devoted leaders in whom the people can put their faith.
20. There is hardly anything lower than a person who does not feel great love, gratitude and respect for his parents.
21. People can be divided into two classes: the weak and the strong.
22. The wild sex life of the old Greeks and Romans was tame compared to some of the goings-on in this country, even in places where people might least expect it.
23. Homosexuals are hardly better than criminals and ought to be severely punished.
24. No sane, normal, decent person could ever think of hurting a close friend or relative.
25. Most of our social problems would be solved if we could somehow get rid of the immoral, crooked and feeble-minded.
26. Some day it will probably be shown that astrology can explain a lot of things.
27. Most people don't realize how much our lives are controlled by plots hatched in secret places.
28. Nobody ever learned anything really important except through suffering.

APPENDIX B

| | Ratings of Person I | | | | | | | You are Person _____ |
|---------------------|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----------------------|
| good | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | bad |
| mature | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | immature |
| unkind | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | kind |
| strong | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | weak |
| unfriendly | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | friendly |
| insincere | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | sincere |
| rational | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | irrational |
| pessimistic | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | optimistic |
| trustworthy | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | untrustworthy |
| dissimilar | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | similar |
| dependent | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | independent |
| dull | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | interesting |
| ambitious | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | unambitious |
| democratic | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | autocratic |
| unpopular | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | popular |
| unselfish | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | selfish |
| warm | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | cold |
| sensitive to others | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | insensitive to others |
| uncreative | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | creative |
| intelligent | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | unintelligent |
| honest | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | dishonest |
| dependable | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | undependable |

How much do you like Person I?

like 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 dislike

How much do you think Person I likes you?

like 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 dislike

How willing would you be to work on another project with Person I?

very willing 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 very unwilling

How willing would you be to meet Person I socially (e.g. inviting him to your place or meeting him at a party)?

very willing 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 very unwilling

APPENDIX C
Game Matrices¹

| | * A | o B |
|------------|--------|--------|
| Person I | 0 | 0 |
| Person II | 3 | 4 |
| Person III | 4 | 3 |

| | A | o* B |
|------------|---|---------|
| Person I | 4 | 4 |
| Person II | 3 | 4 |
| Person III | 2 | 4 |

| | o A | * B |
|------------|--------|--------|
| Person I | 2 | 2 |
| Person II | 4 | 1 |
| Person III | 1 | 4 |

| | A | o* B |
|------------|---|---------|
| Person I | 2 | 2 |
| Person II | 1 | 3 |
| Person III | 2 | 2 |

| | A | o* B |
|------------|---|---------|
| Person I | 3 | 3 |
| Person II | 2 | 1 |
| Person III | 4 | 0 |

| | * A | o B |
|------------|--------|--------|
| Person I | 2 | 2 |
| Person II | 3 | 2 |
| Person III | 3 | 1 |

| | * A | o B |
|------------|--------|--------|
| Person I | 2 | 2 |
| Person II | 0 | 1 |
| Person III | 4 | 0 |

| | o A | * B |
|------------|--------|--------|
| Person I | 3 | 3 |
| Person II | 3 | 3 |
| Person III | 0 | 2 |

| | o A | * B |
|------------|--------|--------|
| Person I | 3 | 3 |
| Person II | 1 | 1 |
| Person III | 2 | 4 |

| | o A | * B |
|------------|--------|--------|
| Person I | 4 | 4 |
| Person II | 3 | 1 |
| Person III | 0 | 0 |

| | * A | o B |
|------------|--------|--------|
| Person I | 4 | 4 |
| Person II | 1 | 3 |
| Person III | 1 | 1 |

| | * A | o B |
|------------|--------|--------|
| Person I | 2 | 2 |
| Person II | 3 | 3 |
| Person III | 3 | 1 |

| | | |
|------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| | [*] A | ^o B |
| Person I | 3 | 3 |
| Person II | 1 | 4 |
| Person III | 4 | 4 |

| | | |
|------------|---|--------------------|
| | A | ^{o*} B |
| Person I | 4 | 4 |
| Person II | 1 | 3 |
| Person III | 0 | 1 |

| | | |
|------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| | [*] A | ^o B |
| Person I | 1 | 1 |
| Person II | 0 | 1 |
| Person III | 4 | 3 |

| | | |
|------------|---|--------------------|
| | A | ^{o*} B |
| Person I | 3 | 3 |
| Person II | 2 | 2 |
| Person III | 1 | 2 |

| | | |
|------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| | ^o A | [*] B |
| Person I | 1 | 1 |
| Person II | 1 | 0 |
| Person III | 0 | 1 |

| | | |
|------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| | ^o A | [*] B |
| Person I | 4 | 4 |
| Person II | 4 | 0 |
| Person III | 1 | 2 |

¹Note: Person I = Rewarder
Person II = Friend
Person III = Subject

* Indicates the choice made when the Subject was being rewarded.
o Indicates the choice made when the Friend was being rewarded.

APPENDIX D

Instructions

This study is about predictive accuracy. You are going to be playing a game with each other in which you will have to predict the choices that one of the others will be making. What we are interested in is seeing how accurately you will be able to predict the other person's choices and how information about that person will affect your predictive accuracy.

So to begin, I will ask you several questions. Listen to each other's answers, so that you will gain some information about each other. Try to answer the questions in a sentence or two.

1. What is your father's occupation?
2. What level of education does your father have? What level of education does your mother have?
3. What is your faculty, your major, and would you have fallen in the Pass, Second Class, or First Class range in your last year of school?
4. What are your vocational objectives?
5. Why are you taking Psychology?
6. What do you know or how do you feel about T-groups?

Rating Scales. Before we go on to play the game, I would like each of you to fill in a rating scale for each of the other two people. The reason for this is that a great deal of recent research has demonstrated that your impression of a person will affect your accuracy in predicting that person's choices. Therefore, in order to control for this, I would like to make an evaluation of each of the other two persons. Please be completely honest. Don't worry, the other persons will not see your evaluations.

The Game. I would now like to explain how we are going to play a special kind of a three-person experimental game. On the wall in front of you, you see a game matrix. The person making the choices will choose between A or B. On the table in front of you, you will find two cards, one marked A and one marked B. The person making the choice will indicate his choice to me by raising either the A or B card, whichever choice he has made. The other two of you will try to predict which choice he made. Indicate your prediction to me by raising either the A or B card, whichever you think he has chosen. Then, I will raise one of my cards to show you which one he did in fact choose. I will keep record of both the choices and predictions. There will be a series of eighteen of these matrices.

Now, in these matrices, the numbers you see in the various cells represent imaginary amounts of money. These are the rewards of the game. For example, in the matrix you see now, if the person making the choices chooses A, then Person I gets 0¢, Person II gets 1¢, and Person III gets 2¢. However, if B is chosen, then Person I gets 4¢, Person II gets 3¢, and Person III gets 2¢. Remember, the only person that has any control of the payoffs is the one making the choices.

To begin, I would like Person I to make the choices. You will choose for eighteen trials, after which either Person II or Person III will be placed in that position. We will first have two practice trials. Are there any questions? Let's begin.

Rating Scales. Before we begin the second game, we again have to ask you to evaluate each other on the rating scales. Your first

evaluation was the control for the first game set. This evaluation is the control for the second game set. If you recall, I explained that we are controlling for the effect of your impressions of each other on your accuracy of prediction. These two game sets are fairly separate incidents and therefore your evaluations may or may not be the same as they were before the first game. Again, be completely honest in your ratings.

The Game. I would now like to ask Person III to make the choices and for you two to try and predict his choices. Before we begin, I would like Person I and Person III to exchange Person numbers because of the way the matrices were constructed. Remember, you have now changed your Person number so don't get confused when you see the payoff matrices.

Termination. Since we have run out of time, the experiment must be terminated. Therefore, I'm afraid Person II, that you will not have an opportunity to be in the controlling position.

APPENDIX E

High Status Answers

1. My father is the head of the Department of Anesthesiology at the the University Hospital at the University of Michigan.
2. Being an anesthetist, of course, he has completed medical school and also he has done five years of specialization training. My mother has completed her Master's degree in Chemistry.
3. I'm in medicine and I am in my last year of specialization in anesthesia. And as for my academic standing, I would have to go back to my last year of medicine. We really don't get marks in post-graduate work. My academic standing then was in the first class range.
4. My primary interest lies in research rather than the practice of anesthesiology.
5. Well, partly for fun and partly as a basis for some research I am involved in. I'm currently interested in the effects of certain anesthetics on recovery cycles in human memory. I feel that a background in memory is essential for this and so I am taking Psychology 202 in order that I can take some advanced courses in human memory.
6. I have never taken part in one, however, I think I do know a little about them from the reading I've done and also from discussing the idea with some of the people in my department who have been involved in them. The idea of T-groups is attractive, however, it seems that they do need to be properly supervised or to have well trained leaders. As far as evaluating them, I think they should be subjected to the same kind of evaluation as any other therapeutic model.

Low Status Answers

1. My father works as a janitor in an office building.
2. Both have Grade Five.
3. I'm in Arts but I don't have a major yet. My average wasn't too high. I quit school in Grade Eleven and I am now registered as an adult student. In the pass range, I guess.
4. I've worked at a lot of odd jobs but I haven't found anything I like. I really don't know what I want to do.
5. I don't know. It was something to take, I guess.
6. I don't know.

APPENDIX F

Table 1a

Intercorrelation Matrix for the Four Interpersonal Attraction Scales

- Scale 1: Like-Dislike
- Scale 2: Perceived Like-Dislike
- Scale 3: Willingness-Unwillingness to participate in another project
- Scale 4: Willingness-Unwillingness to meet socially

| | Scale 1 | Scale 2 | Scale 3 | Scale 4 |
|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Scale 1 | 1 | .63 | .66 | .64 |
| Scale 2 | | 1 | .60 | .54 |
| Scale 3 | | | 1 | .74 |
| Scale 4 | | | | 1 |

Table 2a
Mean Pretest Liking Ratings of the Rewarder
Status

| | | Low | | High | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|--------|----------------------|--|--------|-------------|
| Reward | Low | 4.5 | 5.13 | (4.82) | | 5.13 | 4.75 (4.94) |
| | High | 3.75 | 5.63 | (4.69) | | 4.63 | 5.13 (4.88) |
| | | (4.13) | (5.38) | | | (4.88) | (5.13) |
| High Authoritarianism | | | | Low Authoritarianism | | | |

Table 2b
Analysis of the Pretest Liking Ratings of the Rewarder

| Source of Variation | | SS | df | MS | F |
|---------------------|------------------------|-------|----|------|-------|
| A: | Authoritarianism | .56 | 1 | .56 | - |
| B: | Status | 6.25 | 1 | 6.25 | 6.42* |
| C: | Reward | 0.00 | 1 | 0.00 | - |
| A x B: | Auth x Status | 5.06 | 1 | 5.06 | 5.20* |
| A x C: | Auth x Reward | .06 | 1 | .06 | - |
| B x C: | Status x Reward | .25 | 1 | .25 | - |
| A x B x C: | Auth x Status x Reward | 5.06 | 1 | 5.06 | 5.20* |
| Error: | Within Treatments | 54.50 | 56 | .97 | |
| TOTAL | | 71.75 | 63 | | |

* p<.05

Table 3a
Mean Pretest Liking Ratings of the Friend
Status

| | | Low | | High | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|--------|----------------------|--|--------|--------|------|--------|--|
| Reward | Low | 5.68 | 6.0 | (5.84) | | Low | 5.75 | 5.88 | (5.82) | |
| | High | 4.75 | 5.88 | (5.32) | | High | 5.75 | 6.0 | (5.88) | |
| | | (5.22) | (5.94) | | | (5.75) | (5.94) | | | |
| High Authoritarianism | | | | Low Authoritarianism | | | | | | |

Table 3b
Analysis of the Pretest Liking Ratings of the Friend

| Source of Variation | | SS | df | MS | F |
|---------------------|------------------------|-------|----|------|-------|
| A: | Authoritarianism | 1.27 | 1 | 1.27 | 1.68 |
| B: | Status | 3.52 | 1 | 3.52 | 4.67* |
| C: | Reward | .77 | 1 | .77 | 1.02 |
| A x B: | Auth x Status | 1.27 | 1 | 1.27 | 1.68 |
| A x C: | Auth x Reward | 1.27 | 1 | 1.27 | 1.68 |
| B x C: | Status x Reward | .77 | 1 | .77 | 1.02 |
| A x B x C: | Auth x Status x Reward | .39 | 1 | .39 | - |
| Error: | Within Treatments | 42.13 | 56 | .75 | |
| TOTAL | | 51.36 | 63 | | |

* p<.05

Table 4a

Mean Pretest Ratings of How Much Subjects
Perceived the Rewarder to Like Them

| | | Status | | | |
|--------|------|-----------------------|--------|--------|--|
| | | Low | High | | |
| Reward | Low | 4.0 | 3.88 | (3.94) | |
| | High | 3.75 | 4.5 | (4.13) | |
| | | (3.88) | (4.19) | | |
| | | High Authoritarianism | | | |
| | | Low | High | | |
| Reward | Low | 3.63 | 4.13 | (3.88) | |
| | High | 4.5 | 4.0 | (4.25) | |
| | | (4.07) | (4.07) | | |
| | | Low Authoritarianism | | | |

Table 4b

Analysis of the Pretest Ratings of How Much Subjects
Perceived the Rewarder to Like Them

| Source of Variation | | SS | df | MS | F |
|---------------------|------------------------|-------|----|------|-------|
| A: | Authoritarianism | .02 | 1 | .02 | - |
| B: | Status | .39 | 1 | .39 | - |
| C: | Reward | 1.27 | 1 | 1.27 | 1.81 |
| A x B: | Auth x Status | .39 | 1 | .39 | - |
| A x C: | Auth x Reward | .14 | 1 | .14 | - |
| B x C: | Status x Reward | .02 | 1 | .02 | - |
| A x B x C: | Auth x Status x Reward | 3.52 | 1 | 3.52 | 5.03* |
| Error: | Within Treatments | 39.13 | 56 | .70 | |
| TOTAL | | 44.86 | 63 | | |

* p<.05

Table 5a

Mean Pretest Ratings of How Much Subjects
Perceived the Friend to Like Them

| | | Status | | |
|--------|------|--------|--------|--------|
| | | Low | High | |
| Reward | Low | 5.13 | 4.38 | (4.76) |
| | High | 4.38 | 5.38 | (4.88) |
| | | (4.76) | (4.88) | |

| | | Low | High | |
|--------|------|--------|--------|--------|
| Reward | Low | 5.13 | 5.5 | (5.32) |
| | High | 5.0 | 5.13 | (5.07) |
| | | (5.07) | (5.32) | |

High Authoritarianism

Low Authoritarianism

Table 5b

Analysis of the Pretest Ratings of How Much Subjects
Perceived the Friend to Like Them

| Source of Variation | | SS | df | MS | F |
|---------------------|------------------------|-------|----|------|-------|
| A: | Authoritarianism | 2.25 | 1 | 2.25 | 2.02 |
| B: | Status | .56 | 1 | .56 | - |
| C: | Reward | .06 | 1 | .06 | - |
| A x B: | Auth x Status | .06 | 1 | .06 | - |
| A x C: | Auth x Reward | .56 | 1 | .56 | - |
| B x C: | Status x Reward | 2.25 | 1 | 2.25 | 2.02 |
| A x B x C: | Auth x Status x Reward | 4.00 | 1 | 4.00 | 3.60* |
| Error: | Within Treatments | 62.25 | 56 | 1.11 | |
| TOTAL | | 72.00 | 63 | | |

* p<.10

Table 6a

Mean Pretest Ratings of the Willingness to Work
on Another Project With the Rewarder

| | | Status | | | |
|--------|------|-----------------------|--------|--------|--|
| | | Low | High | | |
| Reward | Low | 4.75 | 5.13 | (4.94) | |
| | High | 3.75 | 5.38 | (4.57) | |
| | | (4.25) | (5.26) | | |
| | | High Authoritarianism | | | |
| | | Low | High | | |
| Reward | Low | 4.38 | 4.25 | (4.32) | |
| | High | 5.75 | 5.5 | (5.63) | |
| | | (5.06) | (4.88) | | |
| | | Low Authoritarianism | | | |

Table 6b

Analysis of the Pretest Ratings of the Willingness to
Work on Another Project With the Rewarder

| Source of Variation | | SS | df | MS | F |
|---------------------|------------------------|--------|----|-------|--------|
| A: | Authoritarianism | .77 | 1 | .77 | - |
| B: | Status | 2.64 | 1 | 2.64 | 1.63 |
| C: | Reward | 3.52 | 1 | 3.52 | 2.17 |
| A x B: | Auth x Status | 5.64 | 1 | 5.64 | 3.48* |
| A x C: | Auth x Reward | 11.39 | 1 | 11.39 | 7.04** |
| B x C: | Status x Reward | 1.27 | 1 | 1.27 | - |
| A x B x C: | Auth x Status x Reward | 1.89 | 1 | 1.89 | 1.17 |
| Error: | Within Treatments | 90.63 | 56 | 1.62 | |
| TOTAL | | 117.73 | 63 | | |

* p<.10
** p<.01

Table 7a

Mean Pretest Ratings of the Willingness to Work
on Another Project With the Friend

| | | Status | | | |
|--------|------|-----------------------|--------|--------|--|
| | | Low | High | | |
| Reward | Low | 5.88 | 5.75 | (5.82) | |
| | High | 5.0 | 5.88 | (5.44) | |
| | | (5.44) | (5.82) | | |
| | | High Authoritarianism | | | |
| | | Low | High | | |
| Reward | Low | 6.0 | 6.0 | (6.0) | |
| | High | 5.88 | 6.38 | (6.13) | |
| | | (5.94) | (6.19) | | |
| | | Low Authoritarianism | | | |

Table 7b

Analysis of the Pretest Ratings of the Willingness to
Work on Another Project With the Friend

| Source of Variation | | SS | df | MS | F |
|---------------------|------------------------|-------|----|------|------|
| A: | Authoritarianism | 2.64 | 1 | 2.64 | 1.73 |
| B: | Status | 1.89 | 1 | 1.89 | 1.24 |
| C: | Reward | .39 | 1 | .39 | - |
| A x B: | Auth x Status | .14 | 1 | .14 | - |
| A x C: | Auth x Reward | 1.27 | 1 | 1.27 | - |
| B x C: | Status x Reward | 1.89 | 1 | 1.89 | 1.24 |
| A x B x C: | Auth x Status x Reward | .14 | 1 | .14 | - |
| Error: | Within Treatments | 85.38 | 56 | 1.52 | |
| TOTAL | | 93.73 | 63 | | |

Table 9a

Mean Pretest Ratings of the Willingness
to Meet the Friend Socially

| | | Status | | | |
|--------|------|-----------------------|--------|----------------------|--------|
| | | Low | High | | |
| Reward | Low | 5.75 | 5.5 | (5.63) | |
| | High | 5.0 | 6.0 | (5.5) | |
| | | (5.38) | (5.75) | (5.69) | (5.44) |
| | | High Authoritarianism | | Low Authoritarianism | |

Table 9b

Analysis of the Pretest Ratings of the Willingness
to Meet the Friend Socially

| Source of Variation | | SS | df | MS | F |
|---------------------|------------------------|--------|----|------|------|
| A: | Authoritarianism | 0.00 | 1 | 0.00 | - |
| B: | Status | .06 | 1 | .06 | - |
| C: | Reward | .25 | 1 | .25 | - |
| A x B: | Auth x Status | 1.56 | 1 | 1.56 | - |
| A x C: | Auth x Reward | 0.00 | 1 | 0.00 | - |
| B x C: | Status x Reward | 3.06 | 1 | 3.06 | 1.68 |
| A x B x C: | Auth x Status x Reward | .56 | 1 | .56 | - |
| Error: | Within Treatments | 102.25 | 56 | 1.83 | |
| TOTAL | | 107.75 | 63 | | |

Table 10a

Mean Pretest Ratings of the Rewarder Over
All Twenty-two Bipolar Adjective Scales

| | | Status | | | |
|--------|------|-----------------------|--------|--------|--|
| | | Low | High | | |
| Reward | Low | 4.61 | 4.93 | (4.77) | |
| | High | 4.14 | 5.18 | (4.66) | |
| | | (4.38) | (5.06) | | |
| | | High Authoritarianism | | | |
| | | Low | High | | |
| Reward | Low | 4.02 | 5.36 | (4.69) | |
| | High | 4.96 | 5.26 | (5.11) | |
| | | (4.49) | (5.31) | | |
| | | Low Authoritarianism | | | |

Table 10b

Analysis of Pretest Ratings of the Rewarder
Over All Twenty-two Bipolar Adjective Scales

| Source of Variation | | SS | df | MS | F |
|---------------------|------------------------|-----------|----|----------|---------|
| A: | Authoritarianism | 268.14 | 1 | 268.14 | 1.36 |
| B: | Status | 4,372.52 | 1 | 4,372.52 | 22.14** |
| C: | Reward | 185.64 | 1 | 185.64 | - |
| A x B: | Auth x Status | 34.52 | 1 | 34.52 | - |
| A x C: | Auth x Reward | 546.39 | 1 | 546.39 | 2.77 |
| B x C: | Status x Reward | 47.27 | 1 | 47.27 | - |
| A x B x C: | Auth x Status x Reward | 1,491.89 | 1 | 1,491.89 | 7.55** |
| Error: | Within Treatments | 11,059.13 | 56 | 197.48 | |
| TOTAL | | 18,005.48 | 63 | | |

** p<.01

Table 11a

| Mean Change in Liking Scores of the Rewarder | | | | | |
|--|------|-----------------------|--------|---------|--|
| | | Status | | | |
| | | Low | High | | |
| Reward | Low | -1.12 | -.62 | (-.87) | |
| | High | -.25 | .38 | (.06) | |
| | | (-.69) | (-.12) | | |
| | | High Authoritarianism | | | |
| | | Low | High | | |
| | Low | -1.37 | -1.75 | (-1.58) | |
| | High | .13 | .25 | (.19) | |
| | | (-.62) | (-.75) | | |
| | | Low Authoritarianism | | | |

Table 11b

Analysis of the Change in Liking Scores of the Rewarder

| Source of Variation | | SS | df | MS | F |
|---------------------|------------------------|-------|----|-------|---------|
| A: | Authoritarianism | 1.27 | 1 | 1.27 | 1.48 |
| B: | Status | .77 | 1 | .77 | - |
| C: | Reward | 28.89 | 1 | 28.89 | 33.79** |
| A x B: | Auth x Status | 1.89 | 1 | 1.89 | 2.21 |
| A x C: | Auth x Reward | 2.64 | 1 | 2.64 | 3.09 |
| B x C: | Status x Reward | .39 | 1 | .39 | - |
| A x B x C: | Auth x Status x Reward | .14 | 1 | .14 | - |
| Error: | Within Treatments | 47.88 | 56 | .85 | |
| TOTAL | | 83.86 | 63 | | |

** p<.01

Table 12a

Mean Change in Liking Scores of the Friend

| | | Status | | |
|--------|------|-----------------------|--------|--------|
| | | Low | High | |
| Reward | Low | .38 | -.25 | (.06) |
| | High | -.50 | .13 | (-.19) |
| | | (-.06) | (-.06) | |
| | | High Authoritarianism | | |
| | | Low | High | |
| Reward | Low | -.13 | 0 | (-.07) |
| | High | 0 | -.38 | (-.19) |
| | | (-.07) | (-.19) | |
| | | Low Authoritarianism | | |

Table 12b

Analysis of Change in Liking Scores of the Friend

| Source of Variation | | SS | df | MS | F |
|---------------------|------------------------|-------|----|------|---------|
| A: | Authoritarianism | .06 | 1 | .06 | - |
| B: | Status | .06 | 1 | .06 | - |
| C: | Reward | .56 | 1 | .56 | 2.1 |
| A x B: | Auth x Status | .06 | 1 | .06 | - |
| A x C: | Auth x Reward | .06 | 1 | .06 | - |
| B x C: | Status x Reward | .56 | 1 | .56 | 2.1 |
| A x B x C: | Auth x Status x Reward | 3.06 | 1 | 3.06 | 11.43** |
| Error: | Within Treatments | 15.00 | 56 | .27 | |
| TOTAL | | 19.44 | 63 | | |

** p<.01

Table 12c

Analysis of Change in Liking Scores of the
Friend for High Authoritarian Subjects

| Source of Variation | | SS | df | MS | F |
|---------------------|-------------------|-------|----|-----|---------|
| B: | Status | 0 | 1 | - | - |
| C: | Reward | .5 | 1 | - | 1.37 |
| B x C: | Status x Reward | 3.13 | 1 | - | 8.54 ** |
| Error: | Within Treatments | 10.25 | 28 | .37 | |
| TOTAL: | | 13.88 | 31 | | |

** p<.01

Table 12d

Analysis of Change in Liking Scores of the
Friend for Low Authoritarian Subjects

| Source of Variation | | SS | df | MS | F |
|---------------------|-------------------|------|----|-----|------|
| B: | Status | .13 | 1 | - | - |
| C: | Reward | .13 | 1 | - | - |
| B x C: | Status x Reward | .5 | 1 | - | 2.94 |
| Error: | Within Treatments | 4.75 | 28 | .17 | |
| TOTAL: | | 5.5 | 31 | | |

Table 13a

Mean Change in the Subjects' Perception of
How Much the Rewarder Likes Them

| | | Status | | | |
|--------|------|-----------------------|--------|--------|--|
| | | Low | High | | |
| Reward | Low | -.88 | -.63 | (-.76) | |
| | High | .63 | .88 | (.76) | |
| | | (-.13) | (.13) | | |
| | | High Authoritarianism | | | |
| | | Low | High | | |
| Reward | Low | -.63 | -1.0 | (-.82) | |
| | High | .5 | .63 | (.34) | |
| | | (-.29) | (-.19) | | |
| | | Low Authoritarianism | | | |

Table 13b

Analysis of the Change in the Subjects' Perception
of the Rewarder's Liking for Them

| Source of Variation | | SS | df | MS | F |
|---------------------|------------------------|--------|----|-------|---------|
| A: | Authoritarianism | .25 | 1 | .25 | - |
| B: | Status | .06 | 1 | .06 | - |
| C: | Reward | 33.06 | 1 | 33.06 | 23.36** |
| A x B: | Auth x Status | .56 | 1 | .56 | - |
| A x C: | Auth x Reward | .06 | 1 | .06 | - |
| B x C: | Status x Reward | .25 | 1 | .25 | - |
| A x B x C: | Auth x Status x Reward | .25 | 1 | .25 | - |
| Errors: | Within Treatments | 79.25 | 56 | 1.42 | |
| TOTAL | | 113.75 | 63 | | |

** p<.01

Table 14a

Mean Change in the Subjects' Perception of
How Much the Friend Likes Them

| | | Status | | | |
|--------|------|-----------------------|--------|--------|--|
| | | Low | High | | |
| Reward | Low | 0 | .25 | (.13) | |
| | High | .25 | .13 | (.19) | |
| | | (.13) | (.19) | | |
| | | High Authoritarianism | | | |
| | | Low | High | | |
| Reward | Low | -.13 | -.25 | (-.19) | |
| | High | 0 | .13 | (.07) | |
| | | (-.07) | (-.06) | | |
| | | Low Authoritarianism | | | |

Table 14b

Analysis of the Change in the Subjects' Perception
of the Friend's Liking for Them

| Source of Variation | | SS | df | MS | F |
|---------------------|------------------------|-------|----|-----|---|
| A: | Authoritarianism | .77 | 1 | .77 | - |
| B: | Status | .02 | 1 | .02 | - |
| C: | Reward | .39 | 1 | .39 | - |
| A x B: | Auth x Status | .02 | 1 | .02 | - |
| A x C: | Auth x Reward | .14 | 1 | .14 | - |
| B x C: | Status x Reward | .02 | 1 | .02 | - |
| A x B x C: | Auth X Status x Reward | .39 | 1 | .39 | - |
| Error: | Within Treatments | 43.13 | 56 | .77 | |
| TOTAL | | 44.86 | 63 | | |

Table 15a

Mean Change in the Willingness to Participate
in Another Project With the Rewarder

| | | Status | | | |
|--------|------|-----------------------|--------|--------|--|
| | | Low | High | | |
| Reward | Low | -.88 | -.88 | (-.88) | |
| | High | .25 | .38 | (.32) | |
| | | (-.32) | (-.25) | | |
| | | High Authoritarianism | | | |
| | | Low | High | | |
| Reward | Low | -1.13 | -.63 | (-.88) | |
| | High | -.50 | 0 | (-.25) | |
| | | (-.82) | (-.32) | | |
| | | Low Authoritarianism | | | |

Table 15b

Analysis of Change in the Willingness to Participate
in Another Project With the Rewarder

| Source of Variation | | SS | df | MS | F |
|---------------------|------------------------|-------|----|-------|---------|
| A: | Authoritarianism | 1.27 | 1 | 1.27 | 1.22 |
| B: | Status | 1.27 | 1 | 1.27 | 1.22 |
| C: | Reward | 13.14 | 1 | 13.14 | 12.71** |
| A x B: | Auth x Status | .77 | 1 | .77 | - |
| A x C: | Auth x Reward | 1.27 | 1 | 1.27 | 1.22 |
| B x C: | Status x Reward | .02 | 1 | .02 | - |
| A x B x C: | Auth x Status x Reward | .02 | 1 | .02 | - |
| Error: | Within Treatments | 57.88 | 56 | 1.03 | |
| TOTAL | | 75.61 | 63 | | |

** p<.01

Table 16a

Mean Change in the Willingness to Participate
in Another Project With the Friend

| | | Status | | | |
|--------|------|-----------------------|--------|----------------------|--------|
| | | Low | High | | |
| Reward | Low | -.25 | -.50 | (-.38) | |
| | High | -.25 | 0 | (-.13) | |
| | | (-.25) | (-.25) | (-.44) | (-.32) |
| | | High Authoritarianism | | Low Authoritarianism | |

Table 16b

Analysis of Change in the Willingness to Participate
in Another Project With the Friend

| Source of Variation | | SS | df | MS | F |
|---------------------|------------------------|-------|----|------|------|
| A: | Authoritarianism | .25 | 1 | .25 | - |
| B: | Status | .06 | 1 | .06 | - |
| C: | Reward | 1.56 | 1 | 1.56 | 1.79 |
| A x B: | Auth x Status | .06 | 1 | .06 | - |
| A x C: | Auth x Reward | .06 | 1 | .06 | - |
| B x C: | Status x Reward | 1.00 | 1 | 1.00 | 1.15 |
| A x B x C: | Auth x Status x Reward | 0.00 | 1 | 0.00 | - |
| Error: | Within Treatments | 48.75 | 56 | .87 | |
| TOTAL | | 51.75 | 63 | | |

Table 17a

Mean Change in the Willingness to Meet
the Rewarder Socially

| | | Status | | | |
|--------|------|-----------------------|--------|----------------------|--------|
| | | Low | High | | |
| Reward | Low | -.63 | -.88 | (-.76) | |
| | High | .13 | .25 | (.19) | |
| | | (-.25) | (-.32) | (.06) | (-.31) |
| | | High Authoritarianism | | Low Authoritarianism | |

Table 17b

Analysis of Change in the Willingness to
Meet the Rewarder Socially

| Source of Variance | | SS | df | MS | F |
|--------------------|------------------------|-------|----|-------|--------|
| A: | Authoritarianism | .39 | 1 | .39 | - |
| B: | Status | .77 | 1 | .77 | - |
| C: | Reward | 13.14 | 1 | 13.14 | 8.83** |
| A x B: | Auth x Status | .39 | 1 | .39 | - |
| A x C: | Auth x Reward | .02 | 1 | .02 | - |
| B x C: | Status x Reward | .14 | 1 | .14 | - |
| A x B x C: | Auth x Status x Reward | .14 | 1 | .14 | - |
| Error: | Within Treatments | 83.38 | 56 | 1.49 | |
| TOTAL | | 98.36 | 63 | | |

** p<.01

Table 18a

Mean Change in the Willingness to Meet
the Friend Socially

Status

| | | Status | | | |
|--------|------|-----------------------|-------------|----------------------|-------------|
| | | Low | High | Low | High |
| Reward | Low | 0 | -.38 (-.19) | -.25 | -.50 (-.38) |
| | High | -.38 (-.19) | -.13 (-.26) | -.38 (-.32) | -.38 (-.44) |
| | | High Authoritarianism | | Low Authoritarianism | |

Table 18b

Analysis of Change in the Willingness
to Meet the Friend Socially

| Source of Variation | | SS | df | MS | F |
|---------------------|------------------------|-------|----|-----|---|
| A: | Authoritarianism | .39 | 1 | .39 | - |
| B: | Status | .14 | 1 | .14 | - |
| C: | Reward | .02 | 1 | .02 | - |
| A x B: | Auth x Status | .02 | 1 | .02 | - |
| A x C: | Auth x Reward | .02 | 1 | .02 | - |
| B x C: | Status x Reward | .77 | 1 | .77 | - |
| A x B x C: | Auth x Status x Reward | .14 | 1 | .14 | - |
| Error: | Within Treatments | 49.88 | 56 | .89 | |
| TOTAL | | 51.36 | 63 | | |

Table 19a

Mean Change Per Scale in the Overall Rating of the Rewarder

| | | Status | | |
|--------|------|-----------------------|--------|--------|
| Reward | Low | Low | High | (-.46) |
| | | -.47 | -.44 | |
| | High | Low | High | (.04) |
| | | -.08 | .15 | |
| | | (-.28) | (-.15) | |
| | | High Authoritarianism | | |

| | | Status | | |
|--|------|----------------------|--------|--------|
| | Low | Low | High | (-.37) |
| | | -.34 | -.40 | |
| | High | Low | High | (.05) |
| | | .06 | .04 | |
| | | (-.14) | (-.18) | |
| | | Low Authoritarianism | | |

Table 19b

Analysis of the Change in the Overall Rating of the Rewarder

| Source of Variation | | SS | df | MS | F |
|---------------------|------------------------|----------|----|----------|---------|
| A: | Authoritarianism | 20.25 | 1 | 20.25 | - |
| B: | Status | 14.06 | 1 | 14.06 | - |
| C: | Reward | 1,620.06 | 1 | 1,620.06 | 16.84** |
| A x B: | Auth x Status | 56.25 | 1 | 56.25 | - |
| A x C: | Auth x Reward | 9.00 | 1 | 9.00 | - |
| B x C: | Status x Reward | 27.56 | 1 | 27.56 | - |
| A x B x C: | Auth x Status x Reward | 12.25 | 1 | 12.25 | - |
| Error: | Within Treatments | 5,388.00 | 46 | 96.21 | |
| TOTAL | | 7,147.44 | 63 | | |

** p<.01

Table 20a

Mean Percentage of Reward Received by the Rewarder Relative to the Friend Over Three Blocks of Trials (six trials per block)

Block 1

Status

| | | Low | High | |
|--------|------|-------|---------|---------|
| Reward | Low | 99 | 99 | (99) |
| | High | 101 | 102 | (101.5) |
| | | (100) | (100.5) | |

High Authoritarianism

| | | Low | High | |
|--------|------|--------|------|--------|
| Reward | Low | 100 | 99 | (99.5) |
| | High | 99 | 99 | (99) |
| | | (99.5) | (99) | |

Low Authoritarianism

Block 2

Status

| | | Low | High | |
|--------|------|--------|--------|--------|
| Reward | Low | 97 | 100 | (98.5) |
| | High | 100 | 99 | (99.5) |
| | | (98.5) | (99.5) | |

High Authoritarianism

| | | Low | High | |
|--------|------|-------|-------|---------|
| Reward | Low | 99 | 100 | (99.5) |
| | High | 101 | 102 | (101.5) |
| | | (100) | (101) | |

Low Authoritarianism

Block 3

Status

| | | Low | High | |
|--------|------|------|-------|-------|
| Reward | Low | 99 | 101 | (100) |
| | High | 99 | 101 | (100) |
| | | (99) | (101) | |

High Authoritarianism

| | | Low | High | |
|--------|------|---------|-------|--------|
| Reward | Low | 99 | 100 | (99.5) |
| | High | 102 | 100 | (101) |
| | | (100.5) | (100) | |

Low Authoritarianism

Table 20b

Analysis of Percentage of Reward Received by the Rewarder Relative to the Friend Over Three Blocks of Trials (six trials per block)

| Source of Variation | SS | df | MS | F |
|---------------------|----------|-----|-------|-------|
| A: Authoritarianism | 3.00 | 1 | - | - |
| B: Status | 20.02 | 1 | - | 1.66 |
| C: Reward | 63.02 | 1 | - | 5.22* |
| A x B: | 11.02 | 1 | - | - |
| A x C: | .02 | 1 | - | - |
| B x C: | 6.75 | 1 | - | - |
| A x B x C: | 3.00 | 1 | - | - |
| Error: | 676.50 | 56 | 12.08 | |
| J: Trials | 21.57 | 2 | 10.79 | - |
| A x J: | 49.34 | 2 | 24.67 | 1.98 |
| B x J: | 22.32 | 2 | 11.16 | - |
| C x J: | .51 | 2 | .26 | - |
| A x B x J: | 5.01 | 2 | 2.51 | - |
| A x C x J: | 48.45 | 2 | 24.22 | 1.95 |
| B x C x J: | 12.59 | 2 | 6.30 | - |
| A x B x C x J: | 13.78 | 2 | 6.89 | - |
| Error: | 1,393.75 | 112 | 12.44 | |
| TOTAL | 2,350.67 | 191 | | |

* $p < .05$

B30026